

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,320	01/12/2001	Reinhard Walter	LE-A-32-842	3404
75	590 08/29/2002			
RICHARD S BULLITT			EXAMINER	
BAYER CORPORATION 36 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 1910 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-1910			NGUYEN, HELEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. *	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/700,320	WALTER ET AL.			
Advisory Modell	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Helen Nguyen	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a name application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amounth that the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		\			
Claim(s) allowed:	E	EWARD . WEBMAN			
Claim(s) objected to:	F	Primary (Kaminer Group 1500			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-15</u> .		GNOUPYSOU			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.			
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:					
David Taland Ora					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1) Applicants argue that Khankari is not made by a process which includes melting. However, Applicants do not claim a melting step. Even if Applicants added such a step, it is argued that direct compression causes melting to occur. Applicants' argument to the contrary is mere opinion. It is noted that, should Applicants add a melting step, it may well raise a new issue concerning melting and require a further search. 2) Applicants argue that the amount of sugar disclosed in the example is insufficient to disperse the CO2 donor. However, on page 2, paragraph 3, Leslie discloses the acid/base couple dispersed in a matrix. Therefore, it is argued, the sugars of Leslie must meet Applicants claimed amount. 3) Applicants argue that the Leslie reference does not cause melting. However, Applicants claim temperature ranges below that of the Leslie's temperature.